

1  
2  
3  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
4  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
5  
**SAN JOSE DIVISION**  
6  
7

8           ASUS COMPUTER INTERNATIONAL, et  
al.,

Case No. 15-cv-01716-BLF

9           Plaintiffs,

10           v.

11           INTERDIGITAL, INC., et al.,  
12           Defendants.  
13

**ORDER GRANTING SEALING  
MOTIONS**

[Re: ECF 94, 108]

14           Plaintiffs move to seal the highlighted portion of an exhibit to the Declaration of Anna  
15 Weinberg, submitted with the Notice of Arbitral Tribunals Decision on Arbitrability, ECF 94, the  
16 entirety of certain exhibits, submitted with the First Amended Complaint (“FAC”), as well as  
17 portions of the FAC. ECF 108. For the reasons stated below, the motions are GRANTED.

18           **I.    LEGAL STANDARD**

19           “Historically, courts have recognized a ‘general right to inspect and copy public records  
20 and documents, including judicial records and documents.’” *Kamakana v. City and Cnty. of  
21 Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435  
22 U.S. 589, 597 & n.7 (1978)). Consequently, access to motions and their attachments that are  
23 “more than tangentially related to the merits of a case” may be sealed only upon a showing of  
24 “compelling reasons” for sealing. *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092,  
25 1101–02 (9th Cir. 2016). Filings that are only tangentially related to the merits may be sealed  
26 upon a lesser showing of “good cause.” *Id.* at 1097.

27           In addition, sealing motions filed in this district must be “narrowly tailored to seek sealing  
28 only of sealable material.” Civil L.R. 79-5(b). A party moving to seal a document in whole or in

1 part must file a declaration establishing that the identified material is “sealable.” Civ. L.R. 79-  
 2 5(d)(1)(A). “Reference to a stipulation or protective order that allows a party to designate certain  
 3 documents as confidential is not sufficient to establish that a document, or portions thereof, are  
 4 sealable.” *Id.*

5 **II. DISCUSSION**

6 The Court has reviewed the sealing motions and respective declarations in support thereof.  
 7 The Court finds the parties have articulated compelling reasons to seal the submitted documents.  
 8 The proposed redactions are also narrowly tailored. The Court’s rulings on the sealing request are  
 9 set forth in the tables below:

10 **A. ECF 94**

<b>Identification of Documents to be Sealed</b>	<b>Description of Documents</b>	<b>Court’s Order</b>
Highlighted portions of Exhibit A to Declaration of Anna Weinberg	Highlighted portions of arbitration interim award contain confidential business and proprietary information and also should remain confidential under arbitration rules.	GRANTED.

11 **B. ECF 108**

<b>Identification of Documents to be Sealed</b>	<b>Description of Documents</b>	<b>Court’s Order</b>
Exhibits A, B, C, and D to Declaration of Ezekiel Rauscher in their entirety	Exhibits to the First Amended Complaint relate to parties’ patent license and non-disclosure agreements and contain proprietary business information.	GRANTED.
Highlighted portions of Exhibit E to Declaration of Ezekiel Rauscher	Highlighted portions of the First Amended Complaint contain discussions of proprietary business information.	GRANTED.

1           **III. ORDER**  
2  
3

4           For the foregoing reasons, the Court GRANTS sealing motions at ECF 94 and 108.  
5  
6

7           **IT IS SO ORDERED.**  
8  
9

10          Dated: September 1, 2016  
11  
12

13            
14          BETH LABSON FREEMAN  
15          United States District Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28